Brush 113579con

- to col. 2, lines 24-26 for the proposition that the reference teaches a method for providing communication service,
- to FIG. 9 to show that the reference has an IP, and
- to ViSSP 40 for the proposition that the reference teaches a database.

As for the "alert message," that Examiner simply recites the claim language of a "message specifies a communication protocol parameter," but provides NO support.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner provides no support for the alert message that is specified in claim 1 because the reference has no such alert message. Because there is no message as defined in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the reference.

It is noted that the word "message" is found in the reference a number of times, but the alert message of claim 1 is a message from the database unit (i.e., the ViSSP, by the Examiner's asserted correspondence) to the IP. FIG. 11 shows the signal flows relative to the FIG. 9 arrangement, and blocks 133, 135, 138 and 142, of the FIG. do show communication from ViSSP to the IP. What is shown, however, is that when the functionality of the IP is required the ViSSP routes the call to the IP using ISUP messages, and that the ViSSP thereafter sends instructions to the IP. The text that accompanies FIG. 11 is found in col. 9 line 28 through col. 10, line 23 teaches that the message which the ViSSP routes to the IP is an ISUP message (the implied protocol thereof), but nowhere is there any teaching as to what protocol is used by the ViSSP to communicate the instructions to the IP. The important point to note is that there are no messages anywhere in the system regarding protocols that are to be used, there are messages from the ViSSP to the IP regarding protocols, and there is certainly no message from the ViSSP to the IP that "specifies a communication protocol parameter." To repeat, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the reference.

Of course, since there is nothing in the reference that teaches the first step of claim 1, it follows that the second step of claim, which specifies

> establishing a connection between said database unit and said intelligent peripheral to operate in accord with a protocol pointed to by said protocol parameter

2

09/11/2007 13:59   9734676589   HENRY BRENDZEL   PAGE 06

Brush 113579con

is also not taught by the reference. This forms a second reason to hold that claim 1 is not anticipated by the reference. It is noted in passing that the Examiner has not pointed to anything in the reference that, purportedly, corresponds to this second step.

In a manner not unlike claim 1, independent claim 2 specifies a step of

> said database unit sending a message to an intelligent peripheral specifying a communication protocol

and a step of

> said intelligent peripheral perusing an internal database to determine parameters for establishing a connection in accord with said protocol.

For the reasons expressed above in connection with Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is not anticipated by the reference, and neither are claims 3-15, which depend on claim 2.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-15 has been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,
Wesley A. Brush
James M. Carnazza
Romel Khan,

Dated: _9/11/07_   By_____
                              Henry T. Brendzel
                              Reg. No. 26,844
                              Phone (973) 467-2025
                              Fax   (973) 467-6589
                              email brendzel@comcast.net

3